

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-13 are pending and have been rejected as follows. Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Anderlind et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,781,972) in view of *Ohta et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,448,692). As indicated above, dependent Claim 14 has been newly added.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Examiner states that the step of determining whether the display data is text or graphic data by comparing the size of the captured data with a predetermined threshold, is unclear because the file size of the captured window is the same regardless of the type of content data. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is mischaracterizing the present application, as recited by the Claims, which are drawn to an apparatus and a method for transmitting captured text data and the captured graphic data that each have a different size (e.g., see, the Paragraph beginning at Line 22, Page 6). Therefore, the Examiner's argument that the file size of the captured window is the same regardless of the type of content data in the captured window size (e.g., see, Office Action, Page 2) is incorrect. Furthermore, the Examiner's argument runs contrary to his previous assertion in which he stated at Page 4 of the Office Action dated October 7, 2005, that it is "very possible [sic] the size of display data [sic] smaller than the predetermined threshold." Accordingly, in light of the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Additionally, regarding the Examiner's assertion in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action at Page 3 that the specification of the present application does not disclose the process of how and what to specifically capture, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. The present application is drawn to an apparatus and a method for capturing data that is displayed on

a display screen and storing this data in, at least, a temporary memory (e.g., see, Specification, Page 3, etc.). In other words, data displayed on the current screen is extracted and stored. That is, if a text is displayed, only the text displayed on the screen is captured, and if an image is displayed, the image displayed on the screen is captured, which is taught on Page 6, lines 16 to 20 with respect to Step 220 of the present application. Therefore, the process of saving data displayed on a screen and determining whether the captured displayed data is text data or image data is clearly disclosed by the present application.

Additionally, with respect to the Examiner's assertion (on Page 4 of the Office Action) that the step of determining whether the display data is text data or graphic data by comparing the size of the display data with a predetermined threshold, as recited in Claim 1, is the same as determining whether the display data is either text or graphic data by comparing the size of the contours with a predetermined threshold, as taught by *Ohta*, the Applicant also respectfully disagrees and has addressed this issue below with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claims 1 and 7.

Additionally, Claims 12 and 13, which are dependent upon Claims 1 and 7, respectively, clearly set forth the difference in size between the types of captured data.

Based on at least the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that rejections of Claims 1 and 7 under §112 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1 under §103(a), the Examiner states that element (9) of FIG. 1 of *Anderlind* teaches the recitation of storing data displayed on the display as display data upon request for capturing the displayed data from a user, as recited by Claim 1. After reviewing FIG. 1 of *Andelind*, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. With reference to FIG. 1 of *Anderlind*, element (9) merely discloses a storage device. However, a method for operating the storage device, as recited by the Claims of the present application, is not disclosed (e.g., see FIG. 9 and Column 3, Lines 8-9 of *Anderlind*). *Ohta* does not cure this deficiency.

The Examiner states that *Anderlind* does not teach or suggest the recitation of determining whether the display data is text data or graphic data by comparing the size of the display data with a predetermined threshold, as recited in Claim 1, and uses *Ohta* to cure this deficiency.

With reference to FIG. 4, *Anderlind* teaches filtering the received data message based on a comparison between the detected profile attributes and the stored profile attributes (e.g., Step 18, FIG. 4). In other words, *Anderlind* teaches using the content of a data message to filter (e.g., see, Column 10, Lines 11-16).

Ohta teaches an image processing device incorporated in a digital copier, facsimile transceiver or similar digital image forming apparatus for effecting various kinds of digital image processing, e.g., erasing, italicizing and shadowing, and blanking with any desired area of an image. *Ohta* further teaches determining whether an image is a text image or a graphic image based on the size of a contour of each portion of the image represented by the image contour information. In other words, *Ohta* teaches determining whether an image is a text image or a graphic image based on the contours of the image.

Ohta teaches first extracting contour data of factors composing one image, comparing the size in X and Y directions of the extracted contour data with predetermined standard value (L1 and L2), and determining whether the document is a noise, a text or a graphic image. In other words, according to *Ohta*, the compared size for separating the text from the graphic image is extracted from lengths X and Y of X and Y coordinates of contour data, while, in the Claims of the present application, the comparison of the size for separating the text from the graphic image indicates the absolute size of the captured data, which, for example, can be in bytes, and which differs from the compared size of a contour as taught by *Ohta*.

However, *Ohta* does not teach or suggest determining whether the display data is text data or graphic data by comparing the size of the display data with a predetermined threshold, as

recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, as *Anderlind* does not cure the deficiencies of *Ohta*, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Based on at least the foregoing, we believe that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Claim 7 includes similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant believes that Claim 7 is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of dependent Claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that *Anderlind* teaches, in Column 3, Line 50 – Column 4, Lines 28, the recitation of wherein the stored text data is a first size; and the stored graphic data it is a second different size, as recited by Claims 12 and 13. After reviewing the cited text of *Anderlind*, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. With reference to Column 3, Line 50 – Column 4, Lines 28, *Anderlind* discloses an interworking unit (113) a base station subsystem (22) and an air interface such as code-division multiple-access (CDMA) global system for mobile communications (GSM), and a time-division multiple-access (TDMA) communication systems. However, the cited text of *Anderlind* does not teach or suggest the recitation of wherein the stored text data is a first size and the stored graphic data it is a second different size, as recited by Claims 12 and 13 in the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4, 8-9, 12-13, and newly added claim 14 are dependent claims; accordingly, if the above arguments place the independent claims into condition for allowance, then these dependent claims will also be in condition for allowance.

The application as now presented, containing Claims 1-4, 7-9 and 12-14, is believed to be

in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters he is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475